DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 301 CS 203 014

TITLE	Options in Education, Transcript for February 23, 1976: Conflict in Theory, Conflict in Research, and Conflict in Practice.
INSTITUTION	George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Inst. for Educational Leadership.; National Public Radio, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	21p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administration; Basic Skills; *Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Energy Conservation; *Interviews; Marihuana; *News Reporting; Racism; *Radio; School Integration; Scripts; Sexuality; Teaching Methods; Womens Education; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Options in Education

ABSTRACT

"Options in Education" is a radio news program which focuses on issues and developments in education. This transcript contains discussions of conflict in theory--education in America, difficulties in dramatizing today's racism, and children's relationships in a predominately black school; conflict in research--marijuana and sexual response, teaching basic skills through drama, and an energy conservation, youth training program; and conflict in practice--women in education and preparing women for administrative advancement. Participants in the program include John Herrow and Wendy Blair, moderators; author Jonathon Kozol; Kenneth B. Clark; Gretchen Schaffr; Harris Rubin; Virgil Harwood; Joe Janetti; and Virginia Nordin. (JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED130301

INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

TRANSCRIPT FOR PROGRAM SCHEDULED FOR BROADCAST

THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 23, 1976

National Public Radio

Options in Education

2025 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036
202-785-6462

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Merrow

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
CONFLICT IN THEORY -	
Jonathon Kozol - "Education in America"	1-3
Dr. Kenneth B. Clark - "Difficulties in Dramatizing Today's Racism"	3-4
Gretchen Schafft - "Green Trees Elementary School"	4-9
CONFLICT IN RESEARCH -	
Dr. Harris Rubin - "Marijuana & Sexual Response"	9-11
Virgil Harwood - "Rats Galore Road Show"	11-12
Joe Janetti - "Energy Conservation Youth Training Program"	13-15
CONFLICT IN PRACTICE -	
"Women in Education", A Series:	
Virginia Nordin - "Preparing Women for Administrative Advancement"	15-17

"Copyright 1976 © by National Public Radio & the Institute for Educational Leadership."

CS203014

OPTIONS IN EDUCATION is an electronic weekly magazine devoted to coverage of news, features, policy & people in the field of education. The program is available for broadcast to the 181 member stations of National Public Radio.

Executive Producer is John Merrow, Producer is Midge Hart, Co-Host is Wendy Blair, Reporter is David Ensor.

Permission is hereby granted for the non-profit reproduction of any and all of the copyrighted material contained in this transcript providing credit is given to National Public Radio's OPTIONS IN EDUCATION.

OPTIONS IN EDUCATION is a co-production of National Public Radio and the Institute for Educational Leadership of the George Washington University.

Principal support is provided by a grant from the National Institute of Education. Additional funds are provided by the Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation, the U.S. Office of Education, the Robert Sterling Clark Foundation and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

(Check your local listings or the NPR member station in your area for time and date of broadcast.)

(MUSIC)

BLAIR: I'm Wendy Blair with NPR's OPTIONS IN EDUCATION . . . .

(MUSIC)

OPTIONS IN EDUCATION is a news magazine about all the issues and development in education - from the ABC's of primary education to the alphabet soup of government programs. If you've ever been to school, we have something that will interest you.

On this edition of OPTIONS IN EDUCATION - Conflict in Theory, Research & Practice.

Conflict in Theory:

GRETCHEN SCHAFFT: "No one is to blame. If integration doesn't work perfectly, who should be surprised?"

Conflict in Research:

DR. HARVEY RUBIN: "Well, marijuana is supplied by the Federal government. As far as the films are concerned, these are stag films which can be purchased in just about any town in this country of decent size . . ."

Conflict in Practice:

VIRGINIA NORDEEN: "Men are standing on principle. They're not going to be stepped on. They're standing up for what's right. The woman is a trouble-maker, hot-shot - we don't want to hire her or move her around because she's going to make trouble."

(MUSIC - "Teach Your Children")

BLAIR: Schools teach our children, of course. But there's always disagreement about what they teach and how well. So, in some sense, schools are always on trial - and we are the judges.

At least one judge - author & critic Jonathon Kozol - has reached a verdict. Kozol, the author of Death At An Early Age and The Night Is Dark And I Am Far From Home, shares his strong opinions with Cary Frumkin of member station WHA in Madison, Wisconsin.

FRUMKIN: Recently, Jonathon, you've linked Patricia Hearst to this concern of yours. Can you explain that to us?

KOZOL: After talking with informants in California and other sections of the nation, those who have protected 20,000 people like Patricia Hearst - all of whom are now, or in recent months, have been living underground, I am reliably convinced that Patty Hearst did not join the SLA due to any form of torture, terror or the like - solely because she went to pieces totally at the first authentic contact in her life with harsh realities of poverty, starvation and extremes of hunger. Patricia's shock at the starvation and hunger which she discovered with the SLA was the direct consequence of the dishonest education she received during her years in school. The identical kind which is provided in both public and private schools

which serve rich children in every section of this nation. A skin deep, shallow patriotism of the kind kids received during 12 years of school depends upon a total shutting out of all realities - of both the good and evil in our land.

It leads in every case either to mindless murders - as in My Lai - obedient thieves at Watergate - numb and paralyzed observers like 90% of the population of this country - or desperate rebels like Patricia Hearst.

FRUMKIN: Now, how about elaborating just a bit on how the public schools fit into all of this?

KOZOL: The public school is a classic example of consumer fraud. It advertises ethics, truth and education. What it sells is straight indoctrination. These conclusions - summarized from 40 classroom visits that I have made from coast-to-coast during the past five years - are reinforced by information gained from students who have lived within the underground or close to it since 1972.

We either drive our kids to lead this self-despising kind of life - of mindless automatons, like the soldiers at My Lai - or else into that desperate existence of those 20,000 kids now underground throughout the nation.

If schools don't change, there will be 50,000 more like Patty Hearst within the next five years. Schools set out to guarantee that we end up with Nixon, Haldeman, Westmoreland - not Thoreau, not Martin Luther King.

FRUMKIN: Now, in view of these concerns, what would you advocate?

KOZOL: It seems to me an ideal moment right now - at this second centennial of the U. S. Revolution - to turn the schools that serve our kids both upside down and inside out. No longer to make the primary goal of education what it has been for the past 100 years to "make this nation strong" - because we're plenty strong enough. You can only destroy the wide world once. But, rather to make us ethical and judicious in the use of strength.

To do this means to turn the traditional priorities of public schooling systems absolutely upside down. In the words of Thoreau, "We should be humans first and subjects second." If we don't, if we don't make this kind of change, the next ten years for sure will see a massive increase in the use of violence, of sabotage, resistence and rebellion, and emotional collapse of every kind - but, primarily, from the children of the rich.

FRUMKIN: Now, there are a lot of people who would say you're linking a lot of rather disparate elements here without a whole lot of evidence. How would you answer that?

KOZOL: Generally, out of the simple logic that people like John Dean and General Westmoreland and Richard Nixon didn't come out of ostrich eggs. Nothing comes out of nothing. These people were prepared for twelve law-mandated years to swallow the chauvinistic, narrow, dishonest, patriotic lies that are fed to every one of us in public school and also in private schools for rich kids as well.

Now a lot of people would like to say, "Doesn't it all start in the home?" Or, "Doesn't it come from the pressure of peers?" Or, "Doesn't it come from watching TV, the media, radio, magazines?" Well, of course, it comes from every place. But there's one distinction about the school: If you don't like what your dad or mom is saying, you can leave the table. You might not get your dessert. If you don't like what they're saying in the Boy Scout Troop or the Brownies, you can quit the troop, and go off and read Thoreau off on a hillside on your own. And if you don't like what you're watching on TV, you can throw it out the window. But if you don't like what they're telling you in public school, you have no alternative within the law, unless you're prepared to go to that more obvious form of prison - called a reform school.

FRUMKIN: Views of Jonathon Kozol. Thank you, Jonathon. Author and outspoken critic of the education this country provides for its children. For National Public Radio, this is Cary Frumkin in Madison, Wisconsin.

BLAIR: In fact, social scientists generally don't agree with Kozol about the power of schools. Most research seems to indicate that children learn far more at home, on the sidewalk, or in front of the television than they do in school.

One social scientist who does agree with Jonathon Kozol - that schools are a powerful influence is Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, whose research on the effects of desegregation on Black children was cited by the Supreme Court in its 1954 decision outlawing public school segregation. Like Kozol, Clark believes that schools have played, and continue to play, a powerful, but generally negative role in shaping young people. What schools now do to Black children is difficult to dramatize as Clark explains to NPR Reporter Marti Griffin.

CLARK: If you look back at the Sixties, the kinds of civil rights problems that were being dealt with were rather concrete, visible ones such as segregation in transportation. You know, the Martin King civil disobedience movement stemmed directly out of Rosa Park's being required to sit in the back of the bus. All of those specific and concrete forms of racism have really been removed. They were the kinds of racism that were relatively easy to dramatize. You could protest against them, and you could know when you'd had those signs removed. You would know when Blacks were no longer required to sit in the back of the bus; when they were no longer excluded from theaters, etc.

The ones that remain - and they're the toughest ones - are those that deal with education: educational retardation, employment discrimination. How do you dramatize reading retardation? How do you dramatize economic/job discrimination that's not only subtle but stem pretty directly out of the primary inequity of racially segregated and inferior schools. The fact of the matter is you don't really require racially prejudiced personnel directors now to have a limit on the number of Blacks who can be employed in certain kinds of jobs - that require educational training and skills.

The basic racial discrimination is being done for prejudiced personnel & employers by the schools. The schools are making sure that a vast percentage of Blacks and colored minorities are not competitive to whites. Now, how do you dramatize that? I don't know. And I wish somebody did. I wish we had a Martin Luther King

living today who could take these problems - that Martin, in the latter days of his life, found to be difficult to deal with - if we could find a brilliant, charismatic figure who could bring to the present deep problems of racial injustice in education, in employment, in housing the drama of the methods that Martin Luther King used in terms of discrimination in transportation, and other concrete ways, we'd be well on our way.

GRIFFIN: What about those statistics that indicate that even when a Black has equal education attainment with a white that he receives less pay on the average and fewer promotions?

CLARK: No question about that. And I interpret that as meaning that there are too few such Blacks. As long as there's a relatively small percentage of Blacks who are competitive educationally, then the system can't impose on them a continuation of racial discrimination than is imposed generally. The system will be hard-pressed to do that if we increase the pool - and the percentage of Blacks who are competitive educationally

BLAIR: Social Scientist Kenneth B. Clark talking with NPR Reporter Marti Griffin. Right now, Clark, who is Black, is embroiled in a bitter dispute with several white social scientists - particularly James Coleman. Normally, social scientists don't go public with their professional criticisms of each other's work, but Dr. Clark has accused Dr. Coleman of deliberately lying to the American public about busing and white flight, and of trying to deny Blacks their basic constitutional rights. We'll have Clark's attack and Coleman's response on next week's OPTIONS IN EDUCATION.

MERROW: I want you to tell me what desegregation is.

CHILD: I don't know what it is.

CHILD: I don't know what it is either.

CHILD: Do you know what it is? I'll find it up in the dictionary.

CHILD: No, I don't know either.

CHILD: I don't know what it is definitely.

CHILD: I know what irrigation is - but segregation. I can take a guess.

SCHAFFT: No one's to blame. If integration doesn't work perfectly, who should be surprised.

BLAIR: One of the reasons it's not perfect is that we tend to be afraid - perhaps because we don't have much to go on. Most of the research has focused on test scores, what happens to academic performance when Blacks and whites go to school together. The conventional wisdom has been that once a school becomes more than half Black, the rest of the whites will do their best to leave, too. But there are schools in which whites are a small minority. What happens in that case? What's it like when the roles are reversed?

Gretchen Schafft has just completed a study of one such public school, which she calls "Green Trees Elementary School". At Green Trees, which is in Washington, D. C., whites make up only 10% of the student body. She explains her 15-month study, and the results, to John Merrow.

SCHAFFT: I wanted to look at white children who constitute a minority in a public school - because I think that's a relatively ignored population, and an important population. Instead of going into a school with a questionnaire, I went in with the idea of keeping my eyes and ears open, and interacting with the children as much as possible.

So, I presented myself as a volunteer to the teachers, letting them know I was also doing a study of children. But I let the teachers decide what kinds of activities would be most useful to carry on in the classroom. And one of the activities that evolved was a community project in which children looked at their community, went out and took pictures of their community with cameras, and talked about historical aspects of their own neighborhood. In the process of doing that, the children drew maps of the neighborhood and on those maps they located their own homes, the homes of their friends, the school, and the streets between all of these places. And I found in looking at the maps later that no Black child had pictured a white child on his or her map, and only a few white children had located the homes of Black children on their maps, and I came to the conclusion that this was one aspect of territoriality among the children.

MERROW: What's territory? Does that mean turf - territoriality?

SCHAFFT: Yeah, I think turf is possibly a better way of putting it. What kinds of locations do we find children in - in the school, outside of school, in the neighborhood? Where are children finding their most comfortable places to play and to interact with one another?

MERROW: Does that mean that, essentially, the way the school functioned was - it was integrated in name only, but basically white kids stayed together and the Black kids stayed together?

SCHAFFT: I don't think that's really the most accurate statement. There is interaction in the classroom. When you only have one or two white children in a classroom of thirty Black children, there's going to be lots and lots of interaction. But outside of school hours, the white children orient themselves to their other white friends, primarily. And they know where their friends live, and they go from their own homes to the homes of their friends - rather than just freely maneuvering through the "turf", as we said before. The area is not their stomping grounds completely. Their homes are their stomping grounds.

MERROW: Now, you have some ideas as to why that happened, though.

SCHAFFT: I think it goes back to our basic anxieties in our long history than less than total relaxation between the races. White parents, who are raising children in a minority situation, in primarily Black neighborhoods, are anxious about their children when they leave their homes. "Where are you going, Alice?" "I'm going to go to Jane's house." "Well, when you get to Jane's house, call me up and tell me you've arrived."

MERROW: You're talking about fear.

SCHAFFT: Well, I think fear is a strong word. I think that is an alert reaction of parents to potential dangers in the neighborhood. Now, when they're playing on the street, the children will be much more spontaneous and there'll be pick-up groups of racially mixed

children playing together, and the children are much freer in their interactions. But, when they're actually making their plans in advance, the children tend to orient themselves toward other white children.

MERROW: You use the phrase - "the imperfect mesh between ideology and behavior". And you're really talking about, I think, parents in that case.

SCHAFFT: White parents have an ideology of integration in this particular neighborhood of Green Trees. They have very deliberately moved to this area to find an economic and racial mixture, and they have a value in their own minds of bringing their children up in a diverse community. The behavior, however, is not matching the ideology perfectly. The parents' own interactions are primarily with white people. They're not primarily with their neighborhood friends or neighborhood people who live next door or down the block.

The white children in the neighborhood do not see a great deal of mixing among adults - except in very specific locations (at the PTA Meeting, at the neighborhood association - which has as one of its goals integration), but for the most part, life is not integrated even in a community which holds integration as a value.

MERROW: So, what happens is that the kids do what they see their parents doing -- not what they hear their parents saying.

SCHAFFT: The children do what they see their parents doing, but they develop the same values that their parents have, too. There are no children among the whites in Green Trees who are out-and-out racists. There are no children who espouse separation of the races or have bad things to say about their Black classmates. But their interactions are primarily with other white children.

MERROW: Maybe it isn't an integrated community. I mean, we ought to just talk about what integration means. Does integration mean that Black kids and white kids are going to play together on a regular basis?

SCHAFFT: Oh I think it's absolutely an integrated community, and I don't think it's a community that has failed. I think it's a community with lots of successes. And I think the school integration has many, many successes. I am only looking at the kind of "perfect" notion we have of integration; that, somehow, if we put our children together, Black children and white children, they will randomly choose each other to play with, and that doesn't happen. But they are learning to know one another. The white children are learning to know many Black children who have so many talents and so many skills and so many good qualities that they have Black peers who they really respect, and that, I think, is one very good criteria for integration.

MERROW: Isn't it reasonable for people to say - "Well, why should we pay any attention to Mrs. Schafft's research and her conclusions? After all, she's a committed integrationist, herself. She lives in a community in which she's a member of the white minority; sends her kids to the same sort of school. Therefore, her research is undoubtedly biased.

SCHAFFT: I think that would be a fair statement to make, and I would answer it by saying - Of course, I started with value premises. But I was aware of those values. I think it's a rare piece of social science research that doesn't start with the investigator having some

kind of value input into the initial design, and I think it's faulty to say that that doesn't exist. The real problem is to identify those values and to evaluate how those values influence the final product. I think as the year progressed, and I was interacting more and more with the children, and coming home and writing voluminous notes, and trying many different approaches to the material, the material took on a life of its own, and in reporting the material, I had no value conflicts about how it had to be reported. The data stood there and told me exactly how it had to be reported upon. It simply was no longer Gretchen Schafft's neighborhood school. It was the Green Trees Project, which had an intellectual life all of its own.

MERROW: You do point up in your paper a number of disturbing things that I know that the national press has picked up on, and that is, for example, the white kids who were afraid to go to the bathroom, and, in fact, never used the bathroom in the course of the entire school year, but prefer to go home for lunch, or even wet their pants.

SCHAFFT: Unfortunately, this is the kind of material that will draw the attention. It is one example of the kind of territoriality that exists. The rougher kids in the school have located the bathroom as the place they can go and exercise their own dominance during the school day. And the personnel is not sufficient to man constant patrols in-and-out of the bathrooms. So, probably, the middle class Black child also would avoid the bathroom. But the white child is so conspicuous. The white child is so obvious, and such a target. And because there is the pattern of anxiety that is built into the child's experience, the child is more anxious and more vulnerable to the rougher kids in the school, and, so, simply avoids getting into situations where he's going to be hassled.

MERROW: So do I. So do we all.

SCHAFFT: Of course, and I did, too. And, as a child, I remembered exactly that kind of territoriality existing in a white school - with different kinds of groupings. Unfortunately, in this school the groupings tend to be Black and white.

MERROW: In my junior high school, it was the boys' room down by the shop, and I never went there. I don't think there were very many Black kids in the school.

SCHAFFT: And I think if most adults couldn't relate to that kind of experience, they wouldn't have picked it up in reading it in the press. But that's the kind of experience that is typical of everyone's young years.

MERROW: Is being white in a Black world the same, or directly comparable to being Black in a white world?

SCHAFFT: No, it's not. The national values and the national expectations are for white children to succeed and for white experience to be valued. White children have a great deal to look forward to. They have every possibility open to them for employment, for careers, for education. They speak the standard dialect of the English language. They come from homes in this particular neighborhood where books and learning are expected parts of the home environment, and they're going to succeed for the most part. These children are going to do very well in their lives.

Black children in a white environment have many more things to cope with. They have to cope with the national image, which is not strong. They have to cope with historical precedents which do not tell them that they are going to succeed. They often are coming out of one or two generations of being middle class, and not long, long histories of middle class associations.

MERROW: You're saying that Green Trees, the particular school, the roles are reversed. But out in the real world, in the rest of the world, Blacks remain a minority. So, you can't just simply flip the coin.

SCHAFFT: No, you can't flip the coin. And I think it's very unfair to put that kind of a character on this situation. What I'm trying to say is that being a minority and experiencing minority status in America is not easy for anyone. If you're handicapped, it's not easy. Sometimes, if you're a woman, it's not easy. If you're the elderly, it's not easy. If you're a white child in a Black school, it's not easy. And people develop strategies to cope with that.

MERROW: Do you think it's a valuable experience for those white kids to be a minority?

SCHAFFT: If I didn't think it was a valuable experience, I wouldn't have my children in the Green Trees School. I think many of the white parents feel that it's an extremely valuable experience, and for many different reasons. Some parents told me that they wanted their children to be able to develop the strengths that come from being the outsider. Many of the parents, themselves, come from families of first generation Americans; had a strong feeling for the explicit values that are stated in the Constitution and the American tradition. They really have a strong feeling that for a child to know what it's like to have difficulty is better for the child's own development and character than to have everything too easy.

MERROW: Since your study became known, and got some attention in the press, Ms. Schafft, what's happened?

SCHAFFT: Well, the reaction has been very mixed. I think the professional community to which I'm relating, as an anthropologist, has been interested, and the response has been of great interest. Many requests for the research information. In the neighborhood, the white parents have been very quiet. They've had very little to say about it. They've asked very few questions. I've had very few requests for the paper, for instance. I think it probably is hard for many white parents to take another look at the experience of their children, and much of that experience has been hidden to them outside of their own purview, and I'm sure they're thinking about it and mulling it over, and probably the questions will occur later.

Among the Black community, I think there has been probably the most reaction, and possibly the most negative reaction. There, again, the feeling is -- White people don't want us in their schools and keep us out all over the country. And, now, the white people in this school are saying our children are making it hard for their children. There's no way we're going to win. And that's a terrible position to be in. And one of the things I wanted so much to get across to the press, and to the public, is that people have tried in

this community, and they've tried hard, and the successes are significant enough so that the white population is stable, and the children are loyal to their school and happy in their school. And, if integration isn't perfect and if children are developing strategies to cope with that imperfect, then I think we should congratulate them on their ingenuity, and I think we should look hard at the situation and help them cope better.

BLAIR: Gretchen Schafft talking with John Merrow in Washington, D. C.

(MUSIC)

Gretchen Schafft explained that her search has attracted national attention and created controversy among her neighbors - Black and white. When the controversy precedes research, as it has in this next instance, then there's an open question as to whether the project will ever get under way. Bill Livek of member station WSIU in Carbondale, Illinois, has a report on one such controversial project.

RUBIN: Well, marijuana is provided by the Federal government. As far as the films are concerned, these are stag films that can be purchased in just about any town in this country of decent size.

LIVEK: To smoke marijuana and view erotic films may sound like a good time to some, but to Dr. Harris Rubin, at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, it's serious business. Dr. Rubin, an SIU School of Medicine psychologist says that he wants to find out if smoking marijuana has any influence on sex drives. The testing, which will consist of male subjects, erotic films, marijuana and electronic devices attached to the genitals, has sparked interest and a great deal of controversy nationally. Even Paul Harvey and Johnny Carson slapped the story into their monologues. Because of the flack and the problems that Dr. Rubin has been having in trying to start his experiment, I asked him why he still continues to pursue his goal to carry out the study.

RUBIN: Well, the study, #1, is terribly important to be done. If it were not important, it would never have been funded by the National Institute on Drug Abuse. But, right now, too, of course, there's a very important issue, and that is - Who determines what experimental research will be done? Is it going to be determined by experts in the field who know what should be done, and what is known in the field? Or is it going to be determined by lay persons who have some feelings - whether they be moral or whatever - about research.

LIVEK: Why are you not measuring females in your study?

RUBIN: Well, that's for a very simple reason. It's simply because of the difference in their anatomy. It's much easier to measure the arousal of the male than it is the female.

LIVEK: Is this not sex discrimination in some way, shape or form?

RUBIN: Well, only in the sense that science has its limitations, and the more information we can get, the better we can do. At this point in time we do not have an effective and accurate enough procedure to measure the woman.

LIVEK: But will the marijuana that Rubin uses be the same type that's sold on the street?

RUBIN: Well, of course, marijuana that is purchased on the street varies tremendously in its potency because of the fact that it's grown in various, different places - whatever. The marijuana that we will use will be coming from the government. It will be pre-essayed so we will know exactly how strong, how potent it is as far as its THC content, and, therefore, be able to accurately control how much THC each one of our subjects gets. The quality, or the potency, I should say, of the marijuana that we will use probably will be larger than that that is normally found on the streets.

LIVEK: Will the volunteers be rolling their own before viewing the films?

RUBIN: No, absolutely not. Because if they did, we would have no way of controlling how much THC, or active ingredient, they would receive. In fact, they will smoke it from a spirometer. Now, a spirometer is a medical apparatus which is designed to measure lung volume. It's an apparatus that has its own amount of gas in it. Generally, that gas is air or carbon dioxide that is blown out of the lungs. In our situation, what we will do is take a known amount of marijuana and burn it - so that all of the smoke from that known amount of marijuana is drawn into the spirometer. Thus, producing a mixture of marijuana smoke and air in the spirometer of a known volume. We know exactly how much is in there. Then, we can have the subject withdraw that gas combination of marijuana smoke and air out of the spirometer in a known amount, and hold it in his lungs for a known period of time so we can make accurate comparisons both within and between subjects on the effect of the drug, and know exactly how much drug he has had.

LIVEK: Dr. Rubin is actively involved in marijuana research, but has he ever smoked the drug before?

RUBIN: No, not before - and still. No, I have not used marijuana.

LIVEK: Do you use it in your study at all - yourself?

RUBIN: I, personally, have a philosophy that an experimenter should know everything about the study that he is doing. Therefore, in all of my studies I always act as a subject, allow myself to be run just exactly the same way any other subject would be - so I can understand precisely what the subjects are going through in the experimental situation. Therefore, yes. In this particular study, when we get started, I will, prior to running other subjects, have myself run as a subject.

LIVEK: There will be no one smoking any marijuana though in Rubin's study until he gets immunity from Federal prosecution. But what is holding up that immunity?

RUBIN: I can't really answer that. I'm sure that the amount of publicity has resulted in a larger letter-writing campaign by some people who feel that research of this nature is immoral, and that this type of issue could in fact become a campaign issue for some congressman or whatever. However, I would hope that the administrators and Congress, for that matter, would understand that science is science, and morals are morals. Ethics are another thing. Every person has a right to his own morals, but to try and make all people behave like one group of people, I think is wrong.

LIVEK: Dr. Harris Rubin of Southern Illinois University. From Carbondale, Illinois, this is Bill Livek for OPTIONS IN EDUCATION.

BLAIR: Well, this may be more than you ever wanted to know about marijuana, but there's been no shortage of volunteers. Over 200 students tried to sign up right after the experiment was announced. We'll keep you posted.

MERROW: What do you know about rats?

CHILDREN: Ohhhh. They're poisonous.

CHILD: They carry diseases.

MERROW: Right. And what else do you know?

CHILD: They'll bite you. And they bite you. You've got to get 13 - I mean, 19 shots.

MERROW: Would you like to have a rat as a pet?

CHILD: No. I'd rather have a gerbil.

CHILD: I'd rather have a mouse.

BLAIR: Well, some students in Western Washington State would rather have rats. As a matter of fact - "Rats Galore". John Kvasnosky has more.

CHILD: At this point, you must push this ball 15 feet. Here she must select a red string from 20 others. Once she does, she gets up on the vertical rope, and then make a "yes/no" decision.

VIRGIL HARWOOD: At the end of the day, when we've traveled and worked hard, we've unloaded the van, set up the show, did two shows, and loaded the van and get back to school at 5:00, and say - "Boy, I'm sure beat, and it's a lot of work. But, boy, was that fun!"

KVASNOSKY: For the last twelve years, 6-grade teacher, Virgil Harwood, has won friends and influenced a lot of his students with the help of some animals that most of us would find detestable - rats. Not your everyday garden-grown variety, but laboratory rats. And it's a program called "Rats Galore".

Since 1964, Harwood has offered 6-graders at the Arton Dale Elementary School in Gig Harbor, Washington, a unique school project evolving around the lowly rat. When he first started, Harwood used rats to teach his kids basic science and psychology. But, when he saw how they turned on to the training and caring of the animals, he took advantage of their excitement to introduce them to other basic skills - like reading and vocabulary, math and speech. He did it by working up a theatrical program that's spectacular even by high school standards. His plan was to have his kids to train rats to perform simple and complex tricks, and then let the students handle the entire production - from ticket booth to curtain call, and to let them also share in the profits.

It worked. In the last five years, more than 100,000 school children have paid their 10¢ to see the "Rats Galore Road Show". Harwood says that in training the rats, the students, themselves, learn to deal with the frustrations of education.

HARWOOD: So, for example, the task of training a rat to solve a two-set problem -- if they don't meet immediately with success, then they become bored with the activity. But, then, if they hang in there - and once they've had one success with a rat - then this motivates them. So, the next time they realize if they just hang in there with this rat, the rat's going to respond and its response will be very satisfying and stimulating to them.

"Your voices are one octave higher than the voices of an adult. And that makes them high pitched. So, when you read a script, you have to speak slowly."

KVASNOSKY: "Rats Galore's" production relies heavily upon language arts. Harwood says that proves hard for a lot of his students. Instead of books and exercises, he prefers to let the show's excitement do the teaching.

HARWOOD: The script is written in such a way that it contains a lot of words that are designed to fit into the student's vocabulary. In other words, it's a vocabulary study in itself. I, also, compile, I would say, maybe a four-to-five month spelling list in this script. So, the script is written with these basic skills in mind, also.

KVASNOSKY: What do you think of the idea of children handling and training rats? Harwood says that the reaction of other teachers is mixed.

HARWOOD: One response we get from some teachers - not too many - they'll say, "With a production like this, when do you ever have time to teach?" And, of course, the answer to that question is that we're teaching all the time during the production. And, of course, other teachers are very quick to see that there is value to this project as an educational tool. There are some teachers who look at this project and can't understand the value of it, and what it could mean to a student.

KVASNOSKY: But, in his mind, Harwood says there's little doubt that programs like "Rats Galore" can open up the world of basic education for a lot of students.

HARWOOD: I've seen what excellent attitudes and energy and effort that the project produces in students. And I'm trying constantly to work at and channel this energy, also, into the academic out-put. So the tighter I can correlate my basic skills programs to the project, the more effective presentation I'm going to make to these students of these basic skills.

"You will be putting on this show, and it will be in a large room - maybe 300 or 400 people in the audience."

KVASNOSKY: For National Public Radio, this is John Kvasnosky in Seattle.

(MUSIC)

MERROW: I'm asking if you know some ways to save energy.

CHILD: Ohhh, that's easy. You can jog a lot, and ride bikes and ride a horse. And smack a tennis ball.

MERROW: How does that save energy?

CHILD: It saves your lungs.

CHILD: And not keeping the lights on all day. And don't have the oven on too long.

CHILD: Save energy? You can -- I forgot.

CHILD: Well, one way to save energy is not using all of it. Oh, what's the other word? What did the teacher say about saving energy?

CHILD: Oh, I know how to save gas. Get one of those Datsuns. They save gas. They get 40 miles per gallon. You should use a generator that makes electricity.

CHILD: But it also uses electricity.

CHILD: Oh, well, that wouldn't do much good.

CHILD: To hang up clothes instead of an electric dryer. Don't use an electric screwdriver. Use a real one.

MERROW: Electric screwdriver?

CHILD: Yeah, I saw one in the Sunday paper.

MERROW: What about other electric things - like an electric ice cream maker.

CHILD: Oh, you should use a hand one.

CHILD: Oh, I know. An electric tape recorder.

MERROW: You mean - use a hand tape recorder.

CHILD: Yes.

BLAIR: Well, those kids have obviously thought about ways of conserving energy. But their sources of information seem to be random: TV, the Sunday paper, sometimes even their teachers. A recent conference in Michigan focused on techniques for teaching energy conservation in a more structured way. These conferences, funded by the Environmental Protection Agency in Washington, have been held in a number of states. Reporter Sheila Sorvari of member station WKAR in East Lansing, Michigan, spoke with Project Coordinator Joe Janetti.

JANETTI: You know how hard it is to try to get a law through the legislature. I mean, can you imagine the people in Washington all of a sudden saying, "Oh, sure. Let's commit $14 billion to the development of solar energy." It's a long way away. They're just not going to do that.

SORVARI: And that, in a nutshell, is why the Energy Conservation Youth Training Program was begun. The Federal Energy Administration is currently funding a number of small projects to get people thinking about the energy situation in America. As one project, the FEA contracted the Bolton Institute to set up education workshops. Last year, the workshops were held in six New England states, and teachers and youth group leaders learned how to teach energy conservation. Director of the current Michigan program, Joe Janetti, explained:

JANETTI: The way it works is that you bring a number of students, young people, and a number of adults, youth group leaders and so on into one room, and start them off in the morning discussing general global questions: What is energy? Where does it come from? Do we have an unlimited supply? And so on. And, as the day progresses, you get more and more particular kinds of questions. Until, by the time the day is over, each group in the room has actually flow-charted a particular project that kids can do, that kids can invent and carry out, which they can see the effect of.

And not only that - but the projects are such that the young people will have to interact with older people. They'll have to go out into the community and find the resources. Like, if you want to build a windmill, where do you get the propeller blade? Where do you get the tower to put it on? And so on.

SORVARI: Thus far, community response has been favorable, which is good since project funds must come from state sources. All Federal dollars went to the Bolton Institute to set the program up. The program in Michigan is being administered by Michigan State University. But Janetti pointed out that once the process starts, the school district will decide for itself just how they want to handle it.

JANETTI: It's the kind of organization that's administered bottom-up as opposed to top-down. So, it really depends a great deal on cooperation, a great deal on communication. We've been told that we're very well organized here in Michigan, and that, in fact, it looks like we might end up being the model state for the program - because we have so many people participating at such levels. You have a situation where you have a representative from General Motors in the same room with a representative from the Michigan Student Environmental Conference, and offering to help on the same project. It's a very cooperative effort. And my thinking is that's the kind of thing we need to do to solve some of the kinds of problems facing our country and world today.

CHILD: We learned a lot of statistics about how much gas there is in the world, and how much coal there is, and everything, and where it's going. And how much energy by the year 2,000 we'll be using, and where people expect all of our energy is going to be coming from. And it's really interesting. It's amazing how much they're depending upon nuclear power, and they're still depending a lot on oil by the year 2,000.

SORVARI: Did you talk about how much energy the United States uses as compared to other countries?

CHILD: They said that we're 6% of the world's population and we use between 30% and 40% of the world's oil. If you ask me, we're real pigs, but . . . .

JANETTI: It's really a great design for community involvement. That's what it's principally about. It's not really a school type education project. It's a community awareness project. And it's using the schools as an avenue, or the kids, as an avenue to get at the popular mentality.

SORVARI: In Vermont, junior and senior high school students drew up energy saving plans for their school and approach the school board for funds. Armed with $300 and a lot of elbow grease, they weather-stripped, calked and covered with plastic all the windows. Thus saving the community $2,000 a year in heating costs. They

then applied for, and received, a $1,400 mini-grant from Title III to set up a toll-free Energy Hotline to the school. They also began a paper recycling project. The profits went for scholarships to students planning careers in conservation and forestry.

JANETTI: This project focused principally on high school age and does go a bit into junior high school age students. However, there is a part of it whereby those same high school kids would go to an elementary school and run, you know, a mini-workshop. The idea was that it would filter both upward in age and downward in age from, say, the 12th to 16-year old group.

BLAIR: Joe Janetti, Coordinator of a Michigan project which is looking for ways to teach energy conservation, talking with Reporter Sheila Sorvari.

One student sums it all up:

"Now, that we're together, I think we're going to try to do more, and, you know, influence more of the community and kids at my school - how to save energy and what to do, and then how to influence parents and stuff like that."

SORVARI: Do you really think students can be effective in implementing change in the environment and energy use?

"Extremely so. Yes, I do. Other than helping - you know, talking to other students and talking to parents, we can also write to congressmen because that's not so hard for us. And we can go down to the court rooms and talk to people of prominence, you know, who have some power in the community."

BLAIR: Our next feature deals with power of another kind. Specifically, the corridors of power in the academic community. This segment of our continuing series on "Women in Education" focuses on women in top administrative positions in American colleges and universities. Of the 2,000 colleges and universities, only 147 have women presidents. And almost all of the 147 preside over women's colleges. Only four coeducational colleges have women in the top spot, and no men's colleges have female presidents. Virginia Nordin is the Director of the Institute for Administrative Advancement, a foundation sponsored project that seeks to prepare women for top administrative jobs. Nordin begins her conversation with John with a description of the normal path to power and influence in the university community.

NORDIN: An administrator who makes academic policy is a former faculty member with tenure, usually brilliant - got tenure early - became a Department Chairperson, served on significant committees. That's a long apprenticeship, and about the only recognized one to become a senior academic administrator.

MERROW: Don't women do that?

NORDIN: One of the major problems now is getting women into graduate school and getting them ready at the beginning. But there's also a problem of women who have graduated over the years. There have been women who have graduated, but they've never been encouraged into these patterns. They weren't seen as future college presidents, I think.

And they didn't know how to handle themselves. What I try to do in my Institute is to simulate academic administration to the extent to give women a glimpse down the corridors of power, and show them what to do, and how to handle themselves.

MERROW: What do you mean? Simulate academic administration? It sounds like you play games.

NORDIN: Well, I hope not. Well, for example, in academe, a lot goes on through social affairs. I don't think it would be realistic to carry on that kind of training institute without having some social affairs where people mix, and you learn the kind of stylized rules of the game. For example, most academic administrators will tell you, at least on your first acquaintance, that they are stewards for the faculty, that they're just there until they can get this terrible job over with, and get back to their laboratory, and that they have very little effect on program.

MERROW: You have a look on your face that says you don't believe that.

NORDIN: Well, I think it's a mythology. It's a very useful and idealistic mythology, but it isn't the way you talk to someone when you really want to tell them how you get ahead. You tell them to go to Washington, to get a high visibility position in education, to join certain organizations, and to move forward. And that's the internal kind of linkages or mentor, or helping hand that men have customarily extended to other men because they see them as future college presidents, but you don't see any of this with women. They don't see women as college presidents. They've had other things to do.

MERROW: So, you're trying to teach women to play the games.

NORDIN: Yes, in effect. And to be qualified, to learn about computer simulation, collective bargaining, negotiation, budgeting, all the kinds of things you need to know. I think they're often excused by senior administrators by - "Well, women aren't experienced in these areas." But both women and men perceive women as being less able to handle certain areas, and we try to concentrate by saying, "Yes, you've had some training in these areas".

MERROW: Isn't it true that society rewards certain kind of behavior in men - that is, being assertive, taking charge - but doesn't necessarily reward that same behavior when it's a woman who exhibits it?

NORDIN: I think that's very true. The way I see it most clearly - and just recently - are the social pictures of men who file reverse discrimination charges and women who file affirmative action complaints. The men are standing on principle. They're not going to be stepped on. They're standing up for what's right. The woman is a trouble-maker, hot-shot. We don't want to hire her, or move her around because she's always going to be making trouble. It's very different. Both men and women perceive men and women that way, but I guess I would hate to agree with you that it's always going to be that way. It may be a long haul, but I hope that we can all arrive at being human beings.

Research in this area becomes dated almost the moment it's published because all of us are in such a state of flux, of learning about each other and changing our perceptions.

MERROW: You know the research. What behavior must a woman exhibit to get ahead?

NORDIN: Well, what I think you're saying is -- If a woman is aggressive or assertive, she's an uppity broad . . .

MERROW: You said that. I didn't say that.

NORDIN: You're saying that people perceive it that way. Perhaps that's what I'm trying to say. And I think that's a question. Women need to learn assertiveness and self-confidence. I've been discussing with a group of women earlier that one of the problems is that you don't validate a woman's experience until she's actually performed a task. Whereas, you see a man as capable of doing it because he follows a similar pattern. And how to change all our heads around about that - both women and men - I don't know. I don't think it's sexist to say that women need some particular encouragement in nurturing through these advancement patterns until they begin to feel more confident on their own. And until they're confident, they'll be perceived as performing inadequately.

MERROW: That's one of those exclusionary "Catch-22" things. You can have the job if you prove that you're capable, but - however - you know what I mean.

NORDIN: In secondary school administration, for example, there's been a dissertation in my department that indicates that women tend to have a sort of probationary appointment: "Well, we'll take her on and see how she does." That means that her subordinates know that they don't react to her position of authority, and then the reaction is -- "Well, we tried a woman, but it didn't work out." And she is undermined in her own self-confidence, but she never had the same establishment of authority and the backing to begin with that a man would have. It's just a question of knowing what the system is and how the game is played. I mean, it's sort of like - All organizations have that kind of private club where there are a lot of unspoken rules. And you're just trying to say that these are some of the unspoken rules so you can learn to handle it in your own way. And, also, to say, these are the kinds of behavior that seem to succeed.

MERROW: You say there are a lot of unspoken rules? And you're a woman. How do you know these unspoken rules?

NORDIN: Woman's intuition.

BLAIR: Virginia Nordin, Director of the Institute for Administrative Advancement at the University of Wisconsin, talking with John Merrow.

(Marlo Thomas & Mel Brooks Comedy Sketch - "Free To Be You & Me")

BLAIR: With a little help from Marlo Thomas & Mel Brooks from the album, "Free To Be You & Me", that's this edition of OPTIONS IN EDUCATION. If you'd like a transcript, send 25¢ to National Public Radio - Education, Washington, D. C. 20036. Remember, we're on every week. So, you'll have to identify which program you want the transcript of. One way to do that is to tell us which particular report you're interested in. The address again: National Public Radio - Education, Washington, D. C. 20036. A cassette costs $4.00

(MUSIC)

This program is produced by Midge Hart. The Executive Producer of OPTIONS IN EDUCATION is John Merrow. I'm Wendy Blair.

CHILD: OPTIONS IN EDUCATION is a co-production of the Institute for Educational Leadership at the George Washington University and National Public Radio.

BLAIR: Principal support for the program is provided by the National Institute of Education. Additional funds to NPR are provided by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and to IEL by the Carnegie Corporation, the U. S. Office of Education, and the Robert Sterling Clark Foundation.

CHILD: This is NPR - National Public Radio.

You can SUBSCRIBE to Options in Education and receive these transcripts regularly. The rate for the full year (November, 1975, through October, 1976) is $10.00 for individuals and institutions.

NO partial subscriptions please. We'll send you the back issues.

THANK YOU.